



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/769,534	01/30/2004	Alejandro Hurtado	42P17764	8641
8791	7590	07/03/2006		EXAMINER
				HA, NATHAN W
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2814

DATE MAILED: 07/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/769,534	HURTADO, ALEJANDRO
	Examiner Nathan W. Ha	Art Unit 2814

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 June 2006.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                            2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

4)  Claim(s) 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 14, 15 and 18-22 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6)  Claim(s) 1-3, 14, 15, 18, 20-21 is/are rejected.

7)  Claim(s) 4-6, 8, 19 and 22 is/are objected to.

8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All   b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.  
\_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 8 is objected to because of the following informalities: claim 8 depends on a canceled claim, claim 7. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

1. The indicated allowability of claims 1-6, 7, 14-15, 18-22 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Glenn et al. Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glenn et al. (US 6,661,080, newly cited, hereinafter Glenn) and in view of Saito et al. (US 6,794,273, newly cited, hereinafter, Saito.)

In regard to claims 1 and 14, in fig. 4, Glenn discloses a method of making a device comprising:

selecting a dicing tap 29 which has adhesion feature, the tap has a thickness greater than a height of one or more bump electrodes 301 formed on the first side of the wafer 35;

applying the dicing tape to the first side of the wafer such that the adhesive layer conforms to the one or more bump electrodes; and

dicing the wafer from a second side of the wafer opposite the first side, the dicing extending into the tape layer a distance less than the thickness of the tape.

Glenn, however, does not include another layer, or adhesive layer, together with the tape.

Saito, in fig. 17, discloses an analogous device further includes an adhesive, or resin layer which covers the bumps. This resin further facilitates the process of cutting the wafer since it strengthens the edges where the blade goes through.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include an extra resin layer in order to take the advantage as mentioned.

4. Claims 2 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glenn and Saito as applied to claims 1 and 14 above, and further in view of Kojima et al. (US 2002/0161100, previously cited, hereinafter, Kojima.)

In regard to claims 2 and 15, the above combination discloses all of the claimed limitations as mentioned above, except the wafer (substrate) is a double bumped wafer.

Kojima, in fig. 29, discloses an analogous device with a double bumped wafer (substrate). This substrate provides better connections to the external devices since connections can be made through the wafer.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to substitute the substrate as taught by Kojima in order to facilitate connections between devices.

Claims 3, 18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glenn and Saito and Jokima as applied to claims 1-314 above, and further in view of Ueda (previously cited.)

In regard to claims 3 and 18, the above combination discloses all of the claimed limitation, except the adhesive or filler is formed by pressure roller in order to provide better adhesion between layers. Ueda teaches using pressure roller to form adhesive sheet ([0042]) in order to facilitate the process since this method is commonly used in order to provide better adhesion.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use the commonly used method as taught by Ueda in order to take the advantage as mentioned.

In regard to claim 20, the above combination discloses all of the claimed limitations as mentioned above, except the thickness of the bumps and the wafer vary from 10-200 microns and 5-250 microns, respectively.

At the time of the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the thickness because applicant has not disclosed that

these thicknesses provide an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solve a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected applicant's invention to perform equally well with either shape because they perform the same function of positioning the module to the substrate.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Ueda and Kojima's combination to obtain the invention as specified in the above claims.

Indeed, it has been held that mere dimensional limitations are *prima facie* obvious absent a disclosure that the limitations are for a particular unobvious purpose, produce an unexpected result, or are otherwise critical. See, for example, *In re Rose*, 220 F.2d 459, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955); *In re Rinehart*, 531 F.2d 1048, 189 USPQ 143 (CCPA 1976); *Gardner v. TEC Systems, Inc.*, 725 F.2d 1338, 220 USPQ 777 (Fed. Cir. 1984), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 830, 225 USPQ 232 (1984); *In re Dailey*, 357 F.2d 669, 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1966).

Note that the specification contains no disclosure of either the critical nature of the claimed dimensions of any unexpected results arising therefrom. Where patentability is based to be based upon particular chosen dimensions or upon another variable recited in a claim, the Applicant must show that the chosen dimensions are critical. *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 1578, 16 USPQ2d 1934, 1936 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

5. Claim 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glenn, Saito and Kojima and Ueda as applied to claims 1-14 above, and further in view of Milla et al. (US 2003/0180987, hereinafter, Milla).

In regard to claim 21, the above combination discloses all of the claimed limitations as mentioned above. Ueda further discloses mounting the wafer on a support member 4 and dicing the wafer into individual chips (claim 52). The combination, however, does not expressly disclose using dual- blade in the dicing process.

Milla, in fig. 4f, discloses an analogous device including element 416 and the chip 422. Milla further discloses using dual blade to dice the wafer in wafer saw 418 to prevent cracking and speed up the cutting process (section [0033]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use dual-blade saw as taught by Milla in order to prevent cracking and speed up the cutting process.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

6. Claims 4-6, 8, 19, and 22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathan W. Ha whose telephone number is (571) 272-1707. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH 8:00-7:00(EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wael Fahmy can be reached on (571) 272-1705. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Nathan Ha  
June 24, 2006